

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. All claims are in independent form.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges indication of the receipt of the priority document(s).

]

Objections

The objections to the drawings and the specification are moot in view of the present amendment. Withdrawal of these objections is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Leyrer* (U.S. Patent 5,729,713) in view of *Cohen, et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,551,001). For at least the reasons set forth below, this rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been cancelled, and this rejection is moot as to this claim.

Claims 1-4 each feature:

``...a power supply switch coupled between the power supply connection and a power supply input of the cache memory...''

The Office Action recognizes that the reference to *Leyrer* lacks a teaching of a power supply switch, and relies on *Cohen, et al.* The Office Action states that *Cohen, et al.* teaches ``...the power supply switch cutting power to the cache when the data processing circuit operates in cache bypass mode (col. 17 lines 55-59)...❏ (Kindly refer to page 4 of the Office Action).

Applicants have reviewed the portion of *Cohen, et al.*, relied upon in the Office Action, and respectfully traverse the assertions of the Office Action referenced above. To wit, the reference to *Cohen, et al.* is drawn to master-slave cache system. The master cache of *Cohen, et al.* does include power-saving features. However, these features do not include the featured power supply switch connected as set forth in claims 1-4 of the present application. Rather the portion of the disclosure of *Cohen, et al.* is limited to a master cache that has a power-down mode that detects periods of time when the master cache is not being accessed, and shuts down the sense amplifiers and other power hungry circuits. (Kindly refer to column 17, lines 51-59 of *Cohen, et al.* for support for these assertions). This is clearly not the same as the power supply switch ***coupled between the power supply connection and a power supply input of the cache memory*** featured in claims 1-4 of the present application.

Because the reference to *Cohen, et al.* lacks at least one of the elements featured in claims 1-4, the rejection of these claims in reliance on *Cohen, et al.* is improper and should be withdrawn.

While Applicants in no way concede as to the propriety of the combination of *Leyrer* and *Cohen, et al.*, or the application of *Leyrer*, because the rejection of claims 1-4 is improper for at least the reasons discussed above, a discussion of this combination and the application of *Leyrer* is unnecessary at this time.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record,

allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, so that late fees may be avoided.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
Philips Electronics N.A., Corp.



by: William S. Francos

(Reg. No. 38,456)

August 8, 2003

Volentine Francos, PLLC

2 Meridian Blvd.

Wyomissing, PA

(610) 375-3513